

Appl. No.: 10/783,607  
Docket No.: 2502187-991300  
Response to Office Action of May 18, 2006

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 21-22, 40-41, 58-59, 71-72 are pending. Claims 1-20, 23-39, 42-57, 60-70 and 73-89 have been cancelled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### **1. Election**

In response to the restriction requirement, the Applicants affirm the election of Group 1 (Claims 1-78), without traverse. Applicants further affirm the election of species of direct drive electrical circuit (claims 15 and 50), without traverse.

The title has been amended to reflect that all the method claims have been cancelled.

#### **2. Rejection of Claims 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 44 Under §102(e)**

Claims 28-29, 31, 33, 35 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,663,659 (McDaniel). While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, these claims have been cancelled to expedite the issuance of the claims indicated as allowable. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue these rejected claims in a continuation application.

#### **3. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17-18, 23, 28-29, 31-37, 42-44 Under §102(b)/103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17-18, 23, 28-29, 31-37 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, or rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over, U.S. Patent 5,464,436 (Smith). While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, these claims have been cancelled to expedite the issuance of the claims indicated as allowable. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue these rejected claims in a continuation application.

Appl. No.: 10/783,607  
Docket No.: 2502187-991300  
Response to Office Action of May 18, 2006

**4. Rejection of Claims 1-15, 19-20, 24-35, 38-39, 43-47, 49-50, 52-57, 60-70, 73-78**

**Under §103(a)**

Claims 1-15, 19-20, 24-35, 38-39, 43-47, 49-50, 52-57, 60-70 and 73-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over McDaniel in view of Smith. While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, these claims have been cancelled to expedite the issuance of the claims indicated as allowable. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue these rejected claims in a continuation application.

**5. Objectionable Claims**

Claims 21, 22, 40, 41, 58, 59, 70, 71 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is evident from the claims and the rejection on page 7 of the Office Action that the Examiner meant to indicate claims 71-72, and not 70-71, as allowable. This was confirmed in a phone call with the Examiner. Therefore, claims 21, 40, 58, and 71 have been so amended. Claims 22, 41, 59 and 72 depend upon these amended independent claims.

Appl. No.: 10/783,607  
Docket No.: 2502187-991300  
Response to Office Action of May 18, 2006

Since all the rejected claims have been cancelled, and the allowable claims amended into independent form, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in a condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: June 8, 2006

By: 

Alan A. Limbach  
Reg. No. 39,749

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Alan A. Limbach  
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP  
2000 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248  
650-833-2433 (Direct)  
650-833-2000 (Main)  
650-833-2001 (Facsimile)  
alan.limbach@dlapiper.com